



United States
Department of
Agriculture

**Forest
Service**

Pacific
Southwest
Region

R5-MB-241A
June 2012



Draft Revised Land and Resource Management Plan

Volume I – Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit



Cover photo:

Jeffrey pine and white fir-mixed conifer (montane zone) setting along Lake Tahoe's west shore. Looking northward to Tahoma and Tahoe City from National Forest System lands at Angora Ridge in Meyers (South Lake Tahoe), California.

Credit – all photos, graphs and maps:

U.S. Forest Service staff, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
may be duplicated for public use (not for profit)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD).

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit
Draft Revised Land and Resource Management Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Statement
June 2012
Alpine, El Dorado, and Placer Counties, California
and
Douglas and Washoe Counties, and Carson City, Nevada

Responsible Agency: USDA Forest Service

Responsible Official: Randy Moore
Regional Forester
Pacific Southwest Region.
1323 Club Drive
Vallejo, CA 94592
(707) 562-9000

For more information contact: Jeff Marsolais
Deputy Forest Supervisor
LTBMU
35 College Drive
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 543-2600

This Proposed Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) describes the framework that will guide on-the-ground projects and program activities. We encourage your comments on all aspects of the Plan.

Public notification for commencement of the 90-day comment period has been published in the Federal Register.

A copy of the notice may be accessed from the LTBMU Forest Plan Revision website at:
<http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/lbmu/ForestPlanRevision>

E-mail comments to: comments-pacificsouthwest-lbmu@fs.fed.us

Subject: "Draft Land Management Plan"

Or submit written comments to: Draft Land Management Plan
LTBMU
35 College Dr.
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

ABSTRACT: The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the consequences of four alternatives for revising the 1988 LTBMU Land and Resource Management Plan (as amended), commonly referred to as the “Forest Plan”. Plan revision provides an updated Forest Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) that would guide management of National Forest System (NFS) lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin for approximately the next 15 years by providing:

- A framework to manage for ecological sustainability and contribute to social and economic sustainability, with resilient ecosystems and watersheds, diverse plant and animal communities, and the capacity to provide people and communities with a range of social, economic, and ecological benefits for present and future generations.
- Strategic direction to guide site-specific project decisions in the context of broader social and ecological considerations.
- Guidance that is flexible enough to remain effective in the face of changing conditions and policies and enable the Forest Supervisor to work with the public to make the best possible decisions in the future.

CITATION:

USDA Forest Service LTBMU. 2012. Draft Revised Land and Resource Management Plan Draft EIS. R5-MB-241B. U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit. CA: South Lake Tahoe.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1-1
Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need for the Revised Forest Plan	1-1
1.1. Introduction.....	1-1
1.2. Plan Area	1-2
1.3. Applicable Planning Regulations	1-4
1.4. Purpose and Need for Forest Plan Revision	1-4
1.5. Decision Framework	1-5
1.5.1. Levels of Planning.....	1-5
1.5.2. Decision to Be Made	1-7
1.6. Plan Content	1-8
1.7. How the Management Direction Is Applied.....	1-10
1.8. The Role of Science in Environmental Analysis	1-10
1.9. Summary of Public Involvement, Scoping & Collaboration.....	1-11
1.10. Plan Revision Issues.....	1-12
1.10.1. Watershed Health and Aquatic Ecosystems Issues	1-12
1.10.2. Terrestrial Ecosystems Issues	1-14
1.10.3. Recreation Issues.....	1-15
1.10.4. Access and Travel Management Issues	1-16
1.11. Laws, Regulations and Policies.....	1-17
Chapter 2 – Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action	2-1
2.1. Development of Alternatives	2-1
2.2. Elements Common to All Alternatives	2-3
2.3. Alternatives Considered in Detail	2-4
2.3.1. Alternative A: No Action (1988 Plan as amended).....	2-5
2.3.2. Alternative B: Proposed Action	2-7
2.3.3. Alternative C.....	2-9
2.3.4. Alternative D.....	2-10
2.4. How the Alternatives Address Relevant Issues	2-12
2.4.1. Watershed Health and Aquatic Ecosystems.....	2-12
2.4.2. Terrestrial Ecosystems.....	2-13
2.4.3. Recreation	2-14
2.4.4. Access and Travel Management.....	2-15
2.5. Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study.....	2-17
2.5.1. Conduct Revision as Part of a Sierra Nevada Ecoregion Plan.....	2-17
2.5.2. Recommend Additional Wild and Scenic Rivers.....	2-17
2.5.3. Revise the Over-Snow Vehicle Use Map.....	2-17
2.5.4. Increase the Pace and Scale of Ecosystem Restoration.....	2-18
2.6. Comparison of Alternatives	2-19
2.6.1. How Plan Decisions Change by Alternative.....	2-19
2.6.2. Comparison Tables	2-25

Chapter 3 – Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences.....	3-1
3.1. Introduction.....	3-1
3.2. Organization of the Analysis.....	3-1
3.2.1. Introduction and Scope of the Analysis.....	3-2
3.2.2. Methodology.....	3-2
3.2.3. Assumptions.....	3-2
3.2.4. Overview of the Affected Environment.....	3-2
3.2.5. Environmental Consequences.....	3-2
3.2.6. Analytical Conclusions.....	3-3
3.3. Assumptions Common to All Alternatives.....	3-10
3.4. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences by Resource Area...3-12	
3.4.1. Access and Travel Management.....	3-12
3.4.2. Air Quality.....	3-30
3.4.3. Aquatic Wildlife Habitat and Species.....	3-80
3.4.4. Botanical Habitat and Species.....	3-119
3.4.5. Botanical Terrestrial Invasive Species.....	3-148
3.4.6. Built Environment.....	3-167
3.4.7. Climate Change.....	3-176
3.4.8. Cultural Resources.....	3-192
3.4.9. Tribal Relations.....	3-195
3.4.10. Fire and Fuels.....	3-197
3.4.11. Forest Vegetation.....	3-230
3.4.12. Interpretive Services, Conservation Education , and Visitor Services.....	3-260
3.4.13. Lands Program.....	3-265
3.4.14. Management Indicator Species (MIS).....	3-277
3.4.15. Natural Hazards.....	3-317
3.4.16. Noise.....	3-321
3.4.17. Recreation.....	3-327
3.4.18. Scenic Resources.....	3-382
3.4.19. Social and Economic Conditions.....	3-399
3.4.20. Soils Resource.....	3-409
3.4.21. Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat and Species.....	3-422
3.4.22. Water Quality and Soil Erosion.....	3-467
3.4.23. Water Quantity.....	3-486
3.4.24. Watershed Condition.....	3-491
3.4.25. Wilderness.....	3-502
3.5. Cumulative Environmental Consequences.....	3-512
3.5.1. Non-Forest Service Lands.....	3-512
3.5.2. Cumulative Effects by Resource Area.....	3-514
3.5.3. Conclusion.....	3-532
3.6. Environmental Justice.....	3-532
3.7. Relationship of Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity.....	3-532
3.8. Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	3-533
3.9. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources.....	3-533

Chapter 4 – Consultation and Coordination.....	1
4.1. Preparers and Contributors	2
4.1.1. Interdisciplinary Team Members – USDA Forest Service.....	2
4.1.2. Other Contributors.....	6
4.2. Consultation.....	8
4.3. Distribution of DEIS Document.....	9
4.3.1. Notification to Individuals & Organizations.....	9
4.3.2. Distribution to Additional Agencies and Community Locations.....	12
DEIS Maps	1
1. Management Areas – Alts. A and B1	
2. Management Areas – Alt. C	
3. Management Areas – Alt. D	
4. Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Zones – Alts. A, B and C	
5. Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Zones – Alt. D	
6. Existing Developed & Permitted Recreation Sites	
7. Existing Developed & Permitted Recreation Sites – Inset	
8. Recreation Residence Tracts	
9. Condition Class Mean Fire Return Interval (FRI)	
10. Changes in Recreation Opportunities – Alt. D	
11. PAC and HRCA Alts. A, B, C and D	
12. Old Forest Emphasis Areas (OFEA) and Critical Aquatic Refuges (CAR)	
13. Species Refuge Areas (Biological) – Alts. B, C and D	
14. Whitebark Pine Species Refuge Area	
Index of DEIS Topics	1

Draft Environmental Impact Statement List of Tables

Table ES-1. Major program strategies by alternative.....	ES-6
Table 2-1. Summary of Key Strategic Differences among Alternatives.....	2-25
Table 2-2 Comparison of Alternatives by Management Area.....	2-32
Table 2-3 Comparison of Alternatives by Environmental Consequences on Resources.....	2-33
Table 3-1. Ongoing Activities and Uses.....	3-5
Table 3-2. LTBMU Road System description, by Maintenance Level.....	3-15
Table 3-3. Trail Classes and Attributes.....	3-17
Table 3-4. Summary of Air Quality Issues and Indicators.....	3-33
Table 3-5. National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ (ppm))....	3-39
Table 3-6 Wildland fire acres in the Lake Tahoe Basin from 2001 to 2010.....	3-42
Table 3-7. 2010 Estimated annual average emissions (tons/day) for natural sources (including wildfire).....	3-44
Table 3-8. Average concentration of NH_3 , HNO_3 , and O_3 for 2002, 2006, and 2010.....	3-45
Table 3-9. LTBMU acreages by Watershed Assessment Units (HUC6) and condition for grouping for N deposition.....	3-50
Table 3-10. Baseline (2000-2004) vs. 2005-2009 data from the Bliss IMPROVE site showing the trend for worst visibility days.....	3-56
Table 3-11. Baseline (2000-2004) vs. 2005-2009 data from the Bliss IMPROVE site showing the trend for the best visibility days.....	3-57
Table 3-12. Best and worst deciviews for the glide path.....	3-59
Table 3-13. Pollutant emissions from prescribed fire for Period 1 (tons).....	3-62
Table 3-14. Pollutant emissions from wildfire for Period 1 (tons).....	3-63
Table 3-15. Total pollutant emissions (prescribed and wildfire) for Period 1 (tons)....	3-64
Table 3-16. Pollutant emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons).....	3-69
Table 3-17. Air toxic emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons of CO_2 equivalent).....	3-70
Table 3-18. Air Quality Impact summary.....	3-79
Table 3-19. Biological Resource Groups and Emphasis.....	3-99
Table 3-20. Comparison of Consequences by Alternative, Aquatic Wildlife.....	3-117
Table 3-21. Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, Candidate, Sensitive Plant Species (TEPCS).....	3-123
Table 3-22. Definitions of the various rankings used to describe rarity status....	3-125
Table 3-23. Number of LTBMU sub-element occurrences for each species of sensitive Botrychium.....	3-129
Table 3-24. Plant species associated with habitat types.....	3-139
Table 3-25 – Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit Non-Native Invasive Species (NNIS) list.....	3-152
Table 3-26. Weather recorded on days when large fire occurred in Lake Tahoe Basin.....	3-210
Table 3-27 Number of ignitions and acres burned by cause (human versus natural) over the last three decades.....	3-211
Table 3-28. Average annual lightning strike occurrence by area approved for managed wildfire by alternative, and estimated ignitions calculated from regression equation.....	3-217
Table 3-29. Acre contributions to effects on indicator by the various vegetation and fuels treatments.....	3-221
Table 3-30. Acre contributions to effects on indicator 2 by prescribed fire and managed wildfire.....	3-222
Table 3-31. Status and Trend of Indicators towards meeting forest restoration goals in the Lake Tahoe Basin.....	3-233
Table 3-32. Seral stages and tree sizes modeled.....	3-237
Table 3-33. Annual Aerial Tree Mortality Survey for the Years 2000 to 2011.....	3-238
Table 3-34. Comparison of average percent of disturbance of Vegetaion by Type and Stage.....	3-240

Table 3-35. Desired Range of Stocking (density) and basal area of live trees and Number of Snags and Coarse Woody Debris on the Forest Floor.....	3-241
Table 3-36. Relative Comparison of the Positive Effects of Each Alternative to Achieving Desired Conditions.....	3-259
Table 3-37. Special Use Permits issued by the LTBMU, as of 12/9/2011.....	3-270
Table 3-38. Management Indicator Species (MIS) components for the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.....	3-279
Table 3-39. Estimated geologic hazards, consequences and risks within the LTBMU....	3-320
Table 3-40. Recreation Indicators.....	3-329
Table 3-41. Visitor Access Opportunities by Trail and Road Miles.....	3-330
Table 3-42. Forest Visits (in 1000's).....	3-333
Table 3-43. Main Recreation Activities Comparison.....	3-334
Table 3-44. Percent of Overall Satisfaction Rating 2005/2010.....	3-336
Table 3-45. 2010 Percent Satisfied Respondents.....	3-336
Table 3-46. ROS Classification (2011).....	3-338
Table 3-47. Inventory of Developed Recreation Sites.....	3-344
Table 3-48. Management Areas Comparison to Recreation Opportunity Spectrum.....	3-350
Table 3-49. Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Classification by Alternative.....	3-351
Table 3-50. Miles of Trails, by Recreation use.....	3-354
Table 3-51. Miles of Roads and Trails for Motorized Use.....	3-357
Table 3-52. Maximum Ski Area Special Use Permit Acreage.....	3-373
Table 3-53. Existing Scenic Integrity Inventory, NFS Acres & Percent of Total Area.....	3-385
Table 3-54 Existing Scenic Stability — NFS Acres and Percent of Total Area.....	3-386
Table 3-55. Comparison of Consequences to Scenic Resources by Alternative.....	3-394
Table 3-56. Scenic Integrity, by Alternative.....	3-396
Table 3-57. LTBMU Economic Contribution to Lake Tahoe Region (2008).....	3-402
Table 3-58. Employment by Program Area for the Lake Tahoe Region.....	3-404
Table 3-59. LTBMU Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) and the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (LTRA Program Funding by Fiscal Year.....	3-405
3-60. LTBMU Program Funding Provided by the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA)	
Table 3-61. Summary of Alternatives by Economic Alternative.....	3-407
Table 3-62. Employment (for the Lake Tahoe Region as defined by zip codes) – total number of jobs contributed.....	3-408
Table 3-63. Comparison of Consequences to the Soil Resource.....	3-420
Table 3-64. Special-status species for the LTBMU, listing status, habitat, and potential for occurrence in the LTBMU during the life of Plan.....	3-423
Table 3-65. Comparison of Alternatives by Habitat Type and Special-status Species....	3-458
Table 3-66. Listed 303(d) stream segments in the Lake Tahoe Basin (2010).....	3-470
Table 3-67. Comparison of overall Best Management Practices Evaluation Program Ratings.....	3-475
Table 3-68. Wilderness Indicators - Recommended Wilderness Acres and Trails by Alternative.....	3-503
Table 3-69. Wilderness lands located within the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit....	3-505
Table 3-70. Impervious cover by land ownership in the Lake Tahoe Basin.....	3-526
Table 3-71. Impervious cover on National Forest System lands by Land Capability Class....	3-527
Table 3-72. Listed 303(d) stream segments in the Lake Tahoe Basin (2010).....	3-530

Draft Environmental Impact Statement List of Figures

Figure 1-1. Vicinity map of National Forest System Lands on the LTBMU....	1-73
Figure 3-1 Air Quality Jurisdictions for LTBMU Area.....	3-37
Figure 3-2 Area designations for federal 8-hour ozone.....	3-41
Figure 3-3 Area designations for state 8-hour ozone.....	3-41
Figure 3-4 Areas likely to contain NOA in the Lake Tahoe Area.....	3-43
Figure 3-5. Passive samplers average O3.....	3-45
Figure 3-6. Passive samplers average O3.....	3-46
Figure 3-7. Passive samplers average NH3.....	3-46
Figure 3-8. Passive samplers average NH3.....	3-47
Figure 3-9. Passive samplers average HNO3.....	3-47
Figure 3-10. Passive samplers average HNO3.....	3-48
Figure 3-11. Concentration of HNO3 for 2 weeks period ending Aug. 1, 2002 (Adapted from Bytnerowicz 2011)	3-48
Figure 3-12. Watershed condition for HUC6.....	3-49
Figure 3-13 Ozone damage to pine needles.....	3-51
Figure 3-14 Bliss IMPROVE site location.....	3-53
Figure 3-15. Glide path proposed in the visibility SIP.....	3-55
Figure 3-16. BLIS1 pollutant species for the best and worst 20%.....	3-55
Figure 3-17. Light extinction from each pollutant on worst visibility days at BLIS1....	3-56
Figure 3-18. Light extinction from each pollutant on best visibility days at BLIS1.....	3-58
Figure 3-19. Worst and best 20% visibility days.....	3-59
Figure 3-20 Pollutant emissions from prescribed fire for Period 1 (tons)....	3-63
Figure 3-21. Pollutant emissions from wildfire for Period 1 (tons).....	3-64
Figure 3-22 Total pollutant emissions (prescribed and wildland) for Period 1 (tons)....	3-65
Figure 3-23. Air toxic emissions for Period 1 (tons).....	3-66
Figure 3-24. Period 1 black carbon emissions (tons)	3-66
Figure 3-25 GHG emissions for Period 1 (metric tons of CO2 equivalents)....	3-67
Figure 3-26. Biomass removed in Period 1 (bone dry tons).....	3-68
Figure 3-27 Pollutant emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons)	3-69
Figure 3-28. Air toxic emissions averted by harvest for Period 1 (tons of CO2 equivalents).....	3-71
Figure 3-29 Above-ground live biomass (bone dry tons).....	3-72
Figure 3-30 Carbon sequestration under each alternative (equivalents of CO2 in metric tons)	3-72
Figure 3-31. Percent of ignitions throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin by fire management unit (FMU) and cause (Human vs. Natural) 1976-2010.	3-205
Figure 3-32. Number of ignitions throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin by fire management unit (FMU) and cause (Human vs. Natural) 1976-2010.....	3-205
Figure 3-33. Fire type map based on FLAMMAP outputs.....	3-205
Figure 3-34. Condition Class based on mean FRID (CC(FRI)).....	3-209
Figure 3-35. Wildfire acres burned in the Lake Tahoe Basin by decade (1973-2010).....	3-212
Figure 3-36. Number of human and natural ignitions 1973-2010.....	3-212
Figure 3-37. Average lightning strike occurrence in the Lake Tahoe Basin recorded by month from 1990 through 2009.....	3-215
Figure 3-38. Average number of lightning strikes occurring from 1990 through 2010 in areas approved for managed wildfire by alternative	3-215
Figure 3-39. Linear regression of lightning ignitions by lightning strikes from 1990 through 2010.....	3-216
Figure 3-40. Potential acres of managed wildfire produced using the Fire Spread Probability (FSPro) model.....	3-218
Figure 3-41. Major Forest California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) vegetation types.....	3-234
Figure 3-42. Cumulative Mortality, trees per acre (TPA) across the LTBMU, 2000-2011....	3-239

Figure 3-43. Alternative A, Red Fir: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-242
Figure 3-44. Alternative A, Red Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-243
Figure 3-45. Alternative A, Jeffrey pine: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-243
Figure 3-46. Alternative A, Jeffrey pine: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-243
Figure 3-47. Alternative A, White Fir-Mixed Conifer: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-244
Figure 3-48. Alternative A, White Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-244
Figure 3-49. Alternative A, All Forest Types: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-244
Figure 3-50. Alternative A, Large Trees >30 in Diameter: Change in Number of Trees by Decade.....	3-245
Figure 3-51. Alternative B, Red Fir: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-247
Figure 3-52. Alternative B, Red Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-247
Figure 3-53. Alternative B, Jeffrey pine: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-248
Figure 3-54. Alternative B, Jeffrey pine: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-248
Figure 3-55. Alternative B, White Fir-Mixed Conifer: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-248
Figure 3-56. Alternative B, White Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-249
Figure 3-57. Alternative B, All Forest Types: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-249
Figure 3-58. Alternative B, Large Trees >30 in Diameter: Change in Number of Trees by Decade.....	3-249
Figure 3-59. Alternative C, Red Fir: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-250
Figure 3-60. Alternative C, Red Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-251
Figure 3-61. Alternative C, Jeffrey pine: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-251
Figure 3-62. Alternative C, Jeffrey pine: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-251
Figure 3-63. Alternative C, White Fir-Mixed Conifer: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-252
Figure 3-64. Alternative C, White Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-252
Figure 3-65. Alternative C, All Forest Types: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-252
Figure 3-66. Alternative C, Large Trees >30 in Diameter: Change in Number of Trees by Decade.....	3-253
Figure 3-67. Alternative D, Red Fir: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-254
Figure 3-68. Alternative D, Red Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-254
Figure 3-69. Alternative D, Jeffrey pine: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-254
Figure 3-70. Alternative D, Jeffrey pine: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-255
Figure 3-71. Alternative D, White Fir-Mixed Conifer: Change in Percent Departure from DCs by Decade.....	3-255
Figure 3-72. Alternative D, White Fir: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-255
Figure 3-73. Alternative D, All Forest Types: Change in Seral Stage Acres by Decade.....	3-256
Figure 3-74. Alternative D, Large Trees >30 in Diameter: Change in Number of Trees by Decade.....	3-256
Figure 3-75. Map of Lake Tahoe Basin distribution and condition of 231 aquatic MIS sites for streams tributary to Lake Tahoe.....	3-285
Figure 3-76. Condition scores for 231 sites sampled from 1998-2007 along 10 major tributaries of Lake Tahoe.....	3-286
Figure 3-77. Map of the Sierra Nevada bioregion for MIS, comprised of ten national forests (including the LTBMU).....	3-318
Figure 3-78. LTBMU Program Funding by Fiscal Year.....	3-406
Figure 3-79. Map of HUC 6 Watersheds Defined in the Lake Tahoe Basin.....	3-495